

REMARKS

In the Office Action of March 17, 2008, the drawings were found objectionable because of the existence of two identical Figure 1s. Submitted herewith are Replacement drawing sheets which eliminate the additional Figure 1. It is submitted that the drawings are now acceptable.

The Office Action also objected to paragraph 0022 of the Specification as containing awkward wording. Paragraph 0022 has accordingly been amended to conform to the corresponding paragraph in the originally filed specification before the Preliminary Amendment. Hence, this amendment is submitted to overcome the issues as to paragraph 0022 and does not add any new matter.

The Abstract was found objectionable because it was not submitted on a separate page. The Abstract has been deleted and re-submitted herewith on a separate page of this Amendment.

The Office Action found claims 16-22 to be allowable. Accordingly, these claims have been represented as new claims 23-29, with in which claim 23 represents a rewriting of allowable claim 16 in independent form. Hence, new claims 23-29 are submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 13-15 were rejected as assertedly anticipated by Wepfer et al U.S. Pat. No. 6,374,152. Independent claim 13 has been amended, whereby for reasons more fully set forth below it is submitted that Claims 13-22 are now also in condition for allowance.

The present invention concerns a yarn cleaner (also known as a yarn clearer) for cleaning effect yarn with different cleaning limits for effects and webs. The Wepfer patent cited in the Office Action discloses a known form of yarn cleaner adapted for cleaning a non-effect yarn, but is not designed for nor reasonably capable of cleaning effect yarns.

An effect yarn is a specialty form of textile yarn having an alternating arrangement of so-called webs (14) of a relatively narrower yarn diameter and so-called effects (13) consisting of predetermined thickenings alternating side by side along the length of the yarn, whereas by contrast normal textile yarns strive for the most uniform possible consistency in yarn diameter over the entire yarn length.

Wepfer discloses a yarn cleaner with adjustable clearing limits, but this yarn cleaner is designed for clearing imperfections from normal yarns of uniform diameter, not effect yarn because naturally in effect yarns every so-called effect would be recognized as a defect or imperfection to be removed. Thus, Wepfer's cleaner is not able to recognize and distinguish an effect as compared to a web. Even if the cleaning limits in Wepfer are adjusted in such a way that the cleaner detects the change in diameter from an effect to a web or from a web to an effect, the cleaner would interpret every such change as a defect.

The Office Action asserts that a device such as that of Wepfer could remove imperfections in the effect, which could be signaled by a higher than expected diameters in the effects. While it may be theoretically possible to adjust the Wepfer device to have an uppermost clearing limit for a maximum diameter of the effects or a lowermost clearing limit for a minimum diameter of the webs, Wepfer is still incapable of being set for a *lowermost* cleaning limit valid for yarn parameters measured in effect regions and an *uppermost* cleaning limit valid for yarn parameters measured in web regions, either or both of which would be necessary to operate effectively to clean effect type yarns.

A lowermost cleaning limit for effects is obviously greater than the predetermined value of the yarn parameter for web regions. Thus, if Wepfer were set for this value, every web would be cleared by the Wepfer yarn cleaner. Likewise, an adequate uppermost cleaning limit for the

webs is lower than the predetermined value for effect regions. Thus, with the Wepfer yarn cleaner adjusted to this value, all effects would be cleaned out. The relation between these predetermined values and the respective cleaning limits are shown in Fig. 3 of the present application. These described cleaning limits can only be defined with a yarn cleaner according to the present invention.

Claim 13 has been amended to make these operating parameters of the present invention more clear. Specifically, as now amended, claim 13 provides that either

(a) the at least one cleaning limit for web regions defines an uppermost value of the yarn parameter measured in web regions of the effect yarn,

(b) the at least one cleaning limit for effect regions defines a lowermost value of the yarn parameter measured in effect regions of the effect yarn, or

(c) both the at least one cleaning limit for web regions defines an uppermost value of the yarn parameter measured in web regions of the effect yarn and the at least one cleaning limit for effect regions defines a lowermost value of the yarn parameter measured in effect regions of the effect yarn.

Wepfer does not teach suggest or even contemplate operation according to these values and, indeed, would be inoperable if so adjusted to perform cleaning on an effect yarn.

It is accordingly submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

It is believed that no fees are required by the amendments made in the present Amendment, as the total number of claims currently presented is less than the number of claims for which filing fees have already been paid. However, if and to the extent any additional fees are

deemed to be due, the Office is authorized to charge such fees, and to credit and overpayment, to Deposit Acct. 18-1215 of the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dalbert U. Shefte", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Dalbert U. Shefte
Kennedy Covington Lobdell & Hickman LLP
Hearst Tower, 47th Floor
214 North Tryon Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202
Telephone (704) 331-5792
-- Attorney for Applicants